

Application No. 09/450,261  
Amendment dated December 22, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of December 10, 2003

#### REMARKS

Rejection of claims 1, 3, 7-8, 10 and 14-18 is maintained under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,795 to Narurkar et al. (hereinafter, "Narurkar") in view of Padwick et al. (Using Microsoft Outlook 98, hereinafter, "Padwick"). Claim 1 calls for a method that includes automatically transferring time sensitive data from a storage coupled to a first processor-based system to a storage coupled to a second processor-based system and automatically displaying the time sensitive data on a display coupled to the second processor-based system at a predetermined time.

It is suggested that Narurkar did not specifically teach that the transferred data is automatically displayed, however, Padwick taught that time sensitive data such as a scheduled reminder can be automatically displayed. The automatic display of time sensitive data on a display coupled to the second processor-based system at a predetermined time where the time sensitive data is automatically transferred for automatic display from a first processor-based system is not taught by the Padwick reference either alone or in combination with the Narurkar reference. The Padwick reference merely teaches automatically displaying transferred data on a system on which the time sensitive data is located or stored at. There is no teaching where Padwick teaches that time sensitive data from one processor-based system to another processor-based system is first transferred and later at a predetermined time displayed automatically.

Generally, Outlook 98 may be loaded in a processor-based system on which time sensitive data also resides. The time sensitive data may be automatically displayed on that system itself. However, there is no teaching in the Padwick reference where data is first automatically transferred from a first system and later automatically displayed on a second system, as claimed in claim 1. Absent such teaching of automatic transfer in combination with automatic display on two different processor-based systems, the limitations in claim 1 are not rendered *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art. Accordingly, the

Application No. 09/450,261  
Amendment dated December 22, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of December 10, 2003

Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the § 103 rejection of independent claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom.

Specifically, while Narurkar did not teach that the transferred data is automatically displayed, as admitted by the Examiner, the Padwick reference merely teaches automatically displaying time sensitive data. However, the time sensitive data is not transferred from a processor-based system to a system on which Outlook 98 is installed, as contemplated by the Examiner. In this manner, the Padwick reference cannot teach an automatic display of data which is automatically transferred from another system because Outlook 98 is simply designed to operate on a single processor-based system on which the time sensitive data resides. Absent a specific teaching or a hint which entails automated display of automatically transferred data involving a two processor-based system combination with particular capabilities, all the claim limitations in claim 1 are not rendered obvious.

The Padwick reference does not teach interacting with another processor-based system from which the time sensitive data has to be automatically transferred to a processor-based system on which the Outlook 98 software does not execute. In fact, the Padwick reference when teaching Outlook 98 software simply indicates that it operates on a single processor-based system on which it is appropriately installed. In other words, interaction between two processor-based systems as claimed in claim 1 is not taught by either the Narurkar reference or the Padwick reference, whether considered alone or in combination. More so, a rationale to combine the teachings must be present in the cited reference itself. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Narurkar and Padwick references and further in view of Kanevsky. Claim 2 calls for a method for the time sensitive data being automatically transferred from the storage coupled to the first processor-based system when it is determined that the first processor-based system is being powered off. The Examiner acknowledges that the Narurkar and the Padwick references do not specifically teach that the

Application No. 09/450,261  
Amendment dated December 22, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of December 10, 2003

automatically transferring is triggered when it is determined that the first processor-based system is being powered off. However, it is suggested that Kanevsky teaches triggering data transferring when the system is determined to be powering off. As set forth above in the context of claim 1, automatic transfer and automatic display of time sensitive data when it is determined that the first processor-based system is being powered off is not taught or suggested by the combination indicated by the Examiner. That is, for similar reasons as to claim 1, claim 2 is also in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested of the Examiner. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider all the pending claims.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: December 22, 2003

Sanjeev K. Singh under 37 C.F.R. § 10.9(b)  
Registration No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024-1805  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906